

Remarks

In the Office Action, the Examiner, correctly noted that claims 1-10 should have been labeled as canceled claims. With this Office Action, claims 1-10 are labeled as canceled.

The Examiner objected to claims 14 and 15 stating that they depend from claim 1, which had been canceled. Claims 14 and 15 have now been amended to depend from claim 11.

The Examiner noted that claim 25 referenced claims 1-5, and this phrase has now been canceled.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11-25, and on page 4, the Examiner rejected claims 26-30 as being unpatentable over de Keyzer et al (WO 02/057386). De Keyzer has been distinguished in present invention in Paragraphs 15-20. More specifically, in Table 2 in Paragraph 0083 (see page 23) Composition B is the same as Composition E in Table 2 of the de Keyzer et al. Specifically, the molecular weight of the polystyrene, the total molecular weight, the coupling efficiency, the polystyrene content percent, the butadiene isoprene ratio, are all identical. From Table 4 of the present invention, on page 25 of the Application, it is noted that Composition B, (the viscosity at 177°C after 24 hours) has gelled and can no longer be measured. Even after 6 hours, the viscosity is now 127 Pa.s, whereas Polymers A, B, and C are still within the range of plus or minus 5% as set forth in each independent claim 11, 16, and 21 of the present invention. More specifically, it is noted that de Keyzer has a range of molecular weight which exceeds that of the present invention and has viscosities measured after 24 hours

which either cannot be measured or are gelled to the extent that their viscosity range, after 24 hours, exceeds the plus or minus 5%. The coupling efficiency in de Keyzer exceeds the claims of the present invention.

In summary, the independent claims of the present invention call for a molecular weight which is less than that in the examples of de Keyzer et al, call for viscosities which vary only within plus or minus 5% after 24 hours (whereas the de Keyzer viscosities have gelled to the extent that they are unmeasurable, or greatly exceed 5%) and the coupling efficiency of the present invention is in a lesser range. In view of these remarks, it is believed that the present application has now sufficiently distinguished itself from de Keyzer, and in fact, is a narrower invention than de Keyzer. It is noted that a chief characteristic of the present invention is to maintain a low viscosity, i.e. maintain it to within plus or minus 5% of the original viscosity. De Keyzer, on the other hand, shows a viscosity which greatly exceeds the 5%, and thus after 24 hours the de Keyzer formulation can no longer be employed as an adhesive composition for pressure sensitive adhesives because the composition in most cases has gelled. Accordingly, not only did the present invention comment on the fact that the de Keyzer reference has poor viscosity (see Paragraph 0017), but this is a key component of the present invention which is a narrower invention than the de Keyzer invention.

Although the undersigned believes that the claims of the present invention more than distinguish over the de Keyzer reference, if the Examiner believes that using the words “consisting essentially of” instead of the word “comprising” would better persuade the Examiner

of the allowability of the present invention, the Examiner is encouraged to please call or otherwise contact the undersigned.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in view of the remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and such is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 27 July, 2009

/Gregory N. Clements/
Gregory N. Clements
Registration No.: 30,713
Attorney for Applicant

CLEMENTS | BERNARD
1901 Roxborough Road, Suite 300
Charlotte, North Carolina 28211 USA
Telephone: 704.790.3600
Facsimile: 704.366.9744
gclements@worldpatents.com

F:\WPNET\KRATON POLYMERS\Patents\L0012-US\Response to 04-27-09 OA 07-27-09.doc